```
1
                  IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
                     FOR THE DISTRICT OF NEBRASKA
 2
     UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, )
 3
                                      8:07CR204
                Plaintiff,
                                      December 19, 2007
                                )
 4
                                      9:05 a.m.
                                      Omaha, Nebraska
      VS.
 5
     ERIC BAIRD,
 6
                Defendant.
 7
 8
 9
                  TRANSCRIPT OF SENTENCING PROCEEDINGS
10
                 BEFORE THE HONORABLE JOSEPH F. BATAILLON
                       UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE
11
12
                           A-P-P-E-A-R-A-N-C-E-S
13
                                  Michael P. Norris
     FOR THE PLAINTIFF:
                                  Assistant United States Attorney
14
                                   1620 Dodge Street
15
                                   Suite 1400
                                   Omaha, Nebraska 68102
16
     FOR THE DEFENDANT:
                                   James E. Schaefer
17
                                   Shapiro & Schaefer
                                   1001 Farnam Street
18
                                   Third Floor
                                   Omaha, Nebraska 68102
19
20
                                   Allan G. Kuhlman
     COURT REPORTER:
21
                                   Suite 3122
                                   111 South 18th Plaza
22
                                   Omaha, Nebraska 68102
23
24
     Proceedings recorded by mechanical stenography, transcript
25
     produced with computer.
```

```
(At 9:05 a.m. on December 19, 2007, with counsel for
 1
 2
     the parties and the defendant present, the following
 3
     proceedings were had:)
              THE COURT: This is the case of United States of
 4
 5
     America versus Eric Baird, case number 8:07CR-204.
 6
              Would the attorneys please enter their appearance
 7
     for the record?
 8
              MR. NORRIS: Good morning, Your Honor. For the
     United States, I'm Michael Norris.
 9
10
              MR. SCHAEFER: Good morning, Judge. Jim Schaefer
     appearing with the defendant.
11
12
              THE COURT: Mr. Baird pled quilty to Count I of the
13
     information on June 14th charging him with possession of
     child pornography in violation of 18, United States Code,
14
15
     Section 2252 subparagraphs (a) (4) (B).
16
               The court accepted the defendant's guilty plea and
     adjudges that the defendant is guilty of the offense charged
17
18
     in Count I of the information.
19
              A presentence investigation report has been
20
     prepared.
21
               I've also reviewed the plea agreement, and we've
     done a number of studies on Mr. Baird in the interim.
22
23
              The court has reviewed the presentence investigation
24
     report.
25
               I've also reviewed the plea agreement and the court
```

```
will accept the plea agreement.
 1
 2
              With respect to the presentence investigation
     report, does the government accept and adopt the presentence
 3
 4
     report, Mr. Norris?
 5
              MR. NORRIS: Yes, Your Honor.
 6
              THE COURT: Mr. Schaefer, do you have any objections
 7
     to the presentence investigation report?
 8
              MR. SCHAEFER: I had questions on a couple of the
     enhancements, Judge, that I don't think we resolved at the
 9
10
     last hearing.
11
              THE COURT: I think you're correct. So how do you
12
     want you to proceed? Do you want any additional evidence?
13
              MR. SCHAEFER: There were two things. Paragraph 22
     and 23.
14
              Paragraph 22 had to do with the five level
15
16
     enhancement for distribution for profit and I think the
     government submitted U.S. versus Griffin indicating it was
17
18
     their position this was a peer-to-peer system that was
19
     utilized by Mr. Baird.
20
              That is just not the case. This wasn't a file
     sharing program he had like Kazaa. It was totally different.
21
     I think that's the evidence in the case file.
22
23
              His folders were not available for downloading from
     anybody that was on the computer like a Kazaa user could do.
24
25
              So I don't think the five level enhancement for
```

```
distribution is appropriate, Judge.
 1
 2
              THE COURT: But he was able to, as I understand the
 3
     evidence, your client was able to obtain pornography by
     accessing someone else's file server?
 4
 5
              MR. SCHAEFER: Yes.
 6
              THE COURT: And then giving something, we're not
 7
     sure what, in order to get something in return?
 8
              MR. SCHAEFER: Right.
 9
              THE COURT: But you don't think that applies under
10
     the five point enhancement?
11
              MR. SCHAEFER: No.
12
              THE COURT: Because he is not the one that had the
13
     peer-to-peer?
              MR. SCHAEFER: Correct.
14
              THE COURT: Mr. Norris?
15
16
              MR. NORRIS: Your Honor, I think Griffin talks about
17
     peer-to-peer and Kazaa and LimeWire and BearShare and some of
18
     those cases.
19
              This is an internet relay chat, which really serves
20
     the same purpose.
21
              Basically, as it says in the search warrant, and as
22
     it says in the response by the probation office to the
23
     objections, according to the search warrant affidavit the
24
     file share server in Rankin, Illinois, had specific
25
     instructions which required the user to upload a certain
```

```
number of images of prepubescent children in exchange for
 1
 2
     being allowed to download images of child pornography.
 3
              So there is an exchange or bartering system going on
     that Griffin talked about, and that really in sum and
 4
 5
     substance is no different than being able to trade images as
 6
     a result of Kazaa or LimeWire or some of these what are known
 7
     as peer-to-peer networks.
 8
               It's the same thing. It's just, I won't say
 9
     prehistoric, but a precursor to what happens later when the
10
     peer-to-peer networks become more popular.
11
              THE COURT: We're using the 2006 sentencing?
12
              MR. NORRIS: Yes.
13
              THE COURT: I know the guidelines have some specific
     language in the notes concerning that. Mr. Schaefer?
14
15
              MR. SCHAEFER: This program I think was designed for
16
     messaging here, Judge, but it does have more functionality
17
     built into it. It does allow what took place in this
18
     particular case.
19
              With the instance messaging situation that we have
20
     here, it does come with the ability to share files, but it's
21
     different.
              It's different in construction than I think what the
22
23
     government is trying to allege here for the five level
24
     increase.
25
              It's widely used for instant communication, but the
```

```
ability to share files, as done here, is not the ability, or
 1
     maybe the target I should say of what is indicated under 2G2.
 2
 3
              I guess that's my position. There was certainly no
 4
     intent by Mr. Baird to distribute anything in return for
 5
     anything else.
 6
              THE COURT: But the government's affidavit says that
 7
     he had to exchange, correct?
 8
              MR. SCHAEFER: Yes, and I know that's in the
     affidavit.
 9
10
              THE COURT: You disagree with the affidavit?
              MR. SCHAEFER: Well, I quess I disagree with the
11
12
     fact that Eric had a file-sharing program in his computer.
13
              THE COURT: And I don't know that anybody says that
     he does.
14
15
              The question, though, is, did he have to exchange or
     barter one set of pornography for another in order to get the
16
17
     pornography that he has?
              And the government's evidence is that he did. Do
18
19
     you have any evidence to the contrary?
20
              MR. SCHAEFER: No, I don't.
              THE COURT: But you believe that the enhancement
21
22
     applies only if your client has the peer-to-peer program, as
23
     opposed to going to another program that has the capability
24
     to barter?
25
              MR. SCHAEFER: Yes.
```

```
THE COURT: And the government's position is it
 1
 2
     doesn't make any difference?
 3
              MR. NORRIS: The government's position is it's the
     exchange and a barter and I don't think the guideline is
 4
 5
     written in the context of a peer-to-peer program.
 6
              It's written in the context of an exchange or barter
 7
     and Griffin expands it to include peer-to-peer programs.
 8
              Well, it doesn't expand it, but states that's what
     it's meant to address.
 9
10
              MR. SCHAEFER: Under the Griffin case the
11
     enhancement was applied because Griffin had that capability.
12
              THE COURT: That would be the next step.
13
              MR. SCHAEFER: Right.
              THE COURT: But Mr. Norris' position is that the
14
     substance of the Griffin case is that someone had to exchange
15
     or barter, one way or another, whether it was on your
16
     computer program or not, that Griffin transcends that
17
     distinction, and your position is that it doesn't?
18
19
              MR. SCHAEFER: Right. That's the issue there.
20
              THE COURT: Mr. Schaefer, do you agree or disagree
     that in order to obtain the images that your client received
21
22
     -- well, do you agree or disagree with the government's
23
     affidavit that your client had to exchange prepubescent
     material in order to get prepubescent material?
24
25
              MR. SCHAEFER: No, I don't agree with that.
```

```
THE COURT: Why not? What evidence do you have to
 1
 2
     that effect?
 3
              MR. SCHAEFER: Well --
              THE COURT: Their affidavit says that that's what
 4
 5
     your client had to do.
 6
              MR. SCHAEFER: The peer-to-peer -- the software that
 7
     is available, there is a difference being actively engaged or
 8
     whether or not it's passing. In other words --
 9
              THE COURT: I understand that, but the government's
10
     affidavit says that your client had to exchange prepubescent
11
     pornography in order to get the prepubescent pornography that
12
     was provided on this server, correct?
13
              MR. SCHAEFER: That's correct, and the reason I
     disagree with that is because that's never been produced.
14
15
              THE COURT: What has never been produced?
16
              MR. SCHAEFER: Whatever he exchanged.
17
              THE COURT: But the government's affidavit says that
18
     that's what occurred, correct?
19
              MR. SCHAEFER: I understand that.
20
              THE COURT: Your position is until they produce it
     you don't believe it?
21
22
              MR. SCHAEFER: Well, that's my position, yes.
23
              THE COURT: And why is that?
24
              MR. SCHAEFER: Well, I don't know. I've seen some
25
     of this material that the government alleged is kiddy porn.
```

```
THE COURT: I see, and you don't think it is?
 1
 2
              MR. SCHAEFER: Some of is and some of it doesn't fit
 3
     the definition.
              MR. NORRIS: Your Honor, I would submit that -- I
 4
 5
     don't know that you have to exchange kiddy porn for kiddy
 6
     porn.
               I think you can exchange four images of adult
 8
     pornography and receive forty-five image of child pornography
 9
     and it still fits under this because it's a barter or trade
10
     situation with the child pornography going one way and the
     other the other way.
11
12
              MR. SCHAEFER: I think Mr. Norris will agree with me
13
     that there was what we call regular porn or adult porn --
              THE COURT: That was exchanged.
14
15
              MR. SCHAEFER: Right.
16
              THE COURT: And what the government wants me to
     do -- do you have the guidelines there in front of you
17
     Mr. Norris?
18
19
               I think it's 2G2.2, subparagraph (b) subparagraph 3,
20
     subparagraph capital (B), distribution for the receipt or
     expectation of receipt of a thing of value, but not for
21
22
     pecuniary gain, increase by five levels.
23
              MR. NORRIS: Right.
24
              THE COURT: Anything further, Mr. Schaefer?
25
              MR. SCHAEFER: One other on paragraph 23, Judge, the
```

```
two level enhancement that has been --
 1
              THE COURT: Oh, no, I just want to talk about this.
 2
              MR. SCHAEFER: No, nothing else on that, Judge.
 3
 4
              THE COURT: I don't think I'm going to go further
 5
     than the Griffin case.
 6
              Distribution for the receipt or expectation of
 7
     receipt of a thing of value, but not for pecuniary gain,
     increase by five levels.
 8
               It seems to me that if Mr. Baird had a peer-to-peer
 9
10
     program in his program, then this probably applies.
11
               If he distributes images that are not unlawful, to
12
     obtain unlawful images, I'm not sure that you can call it a
13
     thing of value.
              And so I think we are pushing the envelope on
14
     distribution under that circumstance, because he's not
15
     distributing anything illegal, and I don't know that you can
16
17
     say he's distributing anything that has value.
18
              So I'm going to sustain the defendant's objection to
19
     paragraph 22.
20
              MR. NORRIS: If you are sustaining the objection to
     paragraph 22, then there is still a two level enhancement
21
22
     under (b) (3) (B) as well or maybe (b) (3) (F).
23
               THE COURT: It's (F), distribution other than
24
     distribution in provisions (A) though (E).
25
              MR. NORRIS: I would submit that it's a two level
```

```
enhancement at least, as opposed to a five under your theory
 1
 2
     then.
 3
              THE COURT: Mr. Schaefer, your position on that?
              MR. SCHAEFER: Doesn't distribution still have to be
 4
 5
     for some illegal purpose?
 6
              If I send out Martha Stewart recipes and get back
 7
     something that is not legit, is that distribution described
 8
     in (A)?
 9
              THE COURT: Mr. Norris, what are we distributing?
10
     Doesn't he have to distribute something illegal?
11
              MR. NORRIS: No, of course not. All he has to do is
12
     exchange.
13
              What he's doing is he's sending four images to get
     forty-five, but that's what he's exchanging, and that's the
14
15
     barter.
16
              THE COURT: So he's distributing something, and as
17
     long as he's distributing something to get something, then
18
     you believe this guideline applies?
19
              MR. NORRIS: And that's the value that I think
20
     applies the five level enhancement, but I'm not arguing that
21
     point any further, because you've decided.
22
              But we are still to the point where you've got an
23
     exchange, and the exchange is I give you four images and --
     you give me four images and in return I will send you
24
25
     forty-five, some of which is going to be child pornography.
```

```
THE COURT: Mr. Schaefer?
 1
 2
              MR. SCHAEFER: I think you've heard the argument,
 3
     Judge. I just don't agree with the enhancement at all in
     this paragraph, paragraph 22.
 4
              THE COURT: This is clearly distribution.
 5
 6
     Distribution under the definition is, distribution means any
 7
     act, including possession with intent to distribute,
 8
     production, advertisement and transportation related to the
     transfer of material involving the sexual exploitation of a
 9
10
     minor.
11
              Distribution includes posting materials involving
12
     the sexual exploitation on a web site, but does not include
13
     the mere solicitation of such material by the defendant.
              Maybe I'm wrong. If it doesn't include solicitation
14
     of such material by a defendant, then how is this
15
16
     distribution, Mr. Norris?
              MR. NORRIS: He's trading and he's receiving in
17
18
     return and actually under the statute, if I had charged him
19
     with receipt, it would have been a prototypical receipt.
20
              He's receiving something in return or he's just
     receiving something.
21
22
              THE COURT: But if he solicits, how is that any
23
     different than asking for it with legal material?
24
              MR. NORRIS: He is not asking for it with legal
25
     material.
```

```
THE COURT: He is asking for it with pornography,
 1
 2
     but there is nothing illegal about pornography unless it's
 3
     prepubescent minors.
              MR. NORRIS: Correct.
 4
 5
              THE COURT: And you can't show that he used
 6
     prepubescent minor material.
              MR. NORRIS: Actually I think I can. May I have a
 8
     minute to talk to my witnesses?
 9
              THE COURT: Yes, you may. Mr. Norris, I have to
10
     tell you, I thought this might run a little long.
              I'm wondering if I can take a guilty plea and then
11
12
     we can come back and it will give you a chance to visit with
13
     your witness.
                        (9:25 a.m. - Recess Taken)
14
               (At 9:50 a.m. on December 19, 2007, with counsel for
15
16
     the parties and the defendant present, the following
17
     proceedings were had:)
18
              THE COURT: We're back on the record and,
19
     Mr. Norris, I asked you to further elaborate why the two
20
     point enhancement applies and not the five point enhancement
     and you may proceed.
21
22
              MR. NORRIS: Your Honor, I would state the
23
     following:
24
              As far as the two points, you've indicated that the
25
     problem that you have with the language on distribution is
```

```
that if you solicit, and merely solicit, then it may not
 1
 2
     apply.
 3
              And I don't take any umbrage with that, but what he
     did here was not merely solicit.
 4
              To me soliciting means asking for and then receiving
 5
 6
     and what he did here was he had to give four items of value
     in order to receive forty-six items of value.
 8
              So that takes it beyond the soliciting and it takes
     it into the bartering/exchanging for something other.
 9
10
              Now, if you go back into that commentary --
              THE COURT: How is it distribution? That is the
11
12
     question. How is it distribution?
13
              I'm trying to relate this in my mind with reality
     besides the computer reality.
14
              If he distributes, that means he has to give
15
     something -- distribute something illegal to get something
16
     illegal, and then that makes him a distributor, as opposed to
17
18
     someone that merely possesses or purchases or receives.
19
              So how is he a distributor if you can't show that he
20
     gave something illegal to get something illegal?
21
              MR. NORRIS: Well, if I show that he gave something
22
     illegal to get something illegal, we are back at the five
23
     level, because that's what commentary says irregardless of
     peer-to-peer. It says you trade child porn for child porn,
24
25
     you're looking at five levels.
```

THE COURT: How do you have anything other than 1 2 that? I know the guidelines say two point is for other distribution. How do we have distribution here? 3 MR. NORRIS: This is why we are agreeing to the two 4 5 levels, and we are agreeing to the two levels because there 6 are four items that are exchanged. The agent has talked to the agent who was involved in this that took the server down. 8 9 Three of those items are clearly not going to be 10 child pornography. We will tell you that right now. 11 They are photographs of either adult women, or they 12 are photographs of undetectable age, and one is fully 13 clothed, so we don't worry about that. But there's a movie out there and the movie has the 14 name of -- if I may have a second I'll put the name on the 15 16 record -- but if that movie comes back as a child pornography movie, and the title is very suggestive of the fact it may 17 18 have child pornography in it, then we go right to the five 19 level. 20 I think the parties are willing to agree that it's a two level. 21 So it's a compromise and I'm willing to not appeal 22 23 the determination on the five level and go with the two level, if that's what they are willing to do. 24 25 MR. SCHAEFER: We are willing to do that, Judge.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

don't recollect -- my initial comment to you was that we didn't think some of that material was illegal, and it turns out that three of the four weren't, but I don't know if and my client doesn't remember what the remainder is, and it could or couldn't be, so we're compromising this morning. THE COURT: I always tell the parties to settle Apparently you've settled it, so I'll apply the two things. point enhancement. And now you have another objection to one of the other paragraphs, is that correct, Mr. Schaefer? MR. SCHAEFER: I do, Judge. Paragraph 23 assesses a two point enhancement for use of a computer to utilize these images for viewing. And my contention is that the information recites that under 2256 that the images are transported in interstate commerce by means of using a computer. So I think that two levels is included as the base offense level. THE COURT: I wish you were right, Mr. Schaefer, but this enhancement has been in the guidelines since as far back as I can remember, and it seems as though it is double counting, but the scheme of the guidelines with respect to the base offense level and then any enhancement for the

computer is the scheme and I think a correct read of the

guidelines gets you to the two points for use of a computer.

```
So I am going to overrule your objection to that.
 1
 2
              MR. SCHAEFER: Then we are ready to proceed to
 3
     sentencing.
              THE COURT: Mr. Baird, did you have an opportunity
 4
 5
     to review the presentence report yourself?
 6
              THE DEFENDANT: Yes, Your Honor, I did.
 7
              THE COURT: The base offense level is 18. Plus two
 8
     for a minor under twelve.
 9
              Plus two for other distribution. Plus two for a
10
     computer being used and plus two for roughly 150 images, for
11
     a gross offense level of 26.
12
              Minus three for acceptance of responsibility gives
     us a total offense level of 23.
13
              Criminal History Category I. Sentencing ranges of
14
15
     imprisonment, 46 to 57 months. The supervised release range
16
     is five years.
17
              The fine range, I believe, is ten thousand to one
18
     hundred thousand dollars, and a one hundred dollar special
19
     assessment.
20
              All right. Mr. Schaefer, do you have a motion for
     downward departure?
21
22
              MR. SCHAEFER: Yes.
23
              THE COURT: You may proceed with respect to that.
               MR. SCHAEFER: Yes. Before I get to that, did you
24
25
     receive the evaluation?
```

```
THE COURT: Yes.
 1
              MR. SCHAEFER: Will that be made part of the
 2
 3
     presentence?
 4
              THE COURT: We can if you want to.
 5
              MR. SCHAEFER: There is one correction.
              THE COURT: You can make it an exhibit or you can
 6
 7
     just ask me to take notice of it. I would prefer we make it
 8
     an exhibit and then I will seal the exhibit.
 9
              MR. SCHAEFER: Let's do that.
10
              THE COURT: Do we have any other exhibits,
     Ms. Slagle, in this matter? Let's be safe and mark it as
11
12
     Exhibit 101.
13
              MR. SCHAEFER: There's only one inaccuracy in that,
14
     Judge.
15
              THE COURT: Does the government have any objection
16
     to Exhibit 101?
17
              MR. NORRIS: No, Your Honor.
18
              THE COURT: It's received and sealed. The
19
     inaccuracy is what?
20
              MR. SCHAEFER: Under sexual assessment on the fourth
     page, very last sentence on that page, under sexual
21
22
     assessment, the very last sentence where it says he reports,
23
     the word, if we could strike out the word male, that is not
24
     correct. That has to be a typo.
25
              THE COURT: I assume you have no idea one way or the
```

```
other on this, is that correct, Mr. Norris?
 1
 2
              MR. NORRIS: I don't know, but I don't think it
 3
     matters in the overall scheme of things, so I don't object if
 4
     you strike it.
 5
              THE COURT: I would rather not strike it, but I
 6
     would rather take your statement that it is inaccurate,
 7
     unless you have the author here to tell me otherwise.
 8
               I'm willing to take into consideration your
 9
     assertion that it is a typographical error or that it is in
10
     error.
               I will agree with Mr. Norris that I don't know that
11
12
     it is of any moment as long as it doesn't have to do with
13
     minors.
              Anything further? Any further evidence,
14
     Mr. Schaefer?
15
16
              MR. SCHAEFER: No other evidence, Judge.
17
              THE COURT: Any other evidence from the government?
18
              MR. NORRIS: No, Your Honor.
19
              THE COURT: You may argue your motion,
20
     Mr. Schaefer.
21
              MR. SCHAEFER: I would like you to depart downward,
22
     Judge, from the level 23.
23
              Mr. Baird has always been a law-abiding citizen. He
24
     was in the service of his country when this criminal activity
25
     was discovered.
```

He's a captain in the United States Air Force with no prior record.

I don't believe that this criminal activity really shows much evidence of any significant planning of any nature.

I hope the court is convinced that Eric is not dangerous at all to the community.

The information that has been developed should lead us to conclude that he's certainly not a pedophile.

He has been examined by a couple different agencies now and I hope that the court is comfortable with the fact that he does not suffer from any mental illness with regard to that.

Captain Baird, when he was discovered, when initially talked to by the agents of the United States Air Force, thought that the material that was contained on that CD had been destroyed.

He had cleaned out his computer before he went on active duty overseas and the criminal activity that was focused on here took place over a very short period of time some time ago.

THE COURT: What evidence is there of that?

MR. SCHAEFER: The computer was looked at and the hard drive was cleaned and what we had left was a CD that was burned and was discovered when the search warrant was served

on Mr. Baird's home.

But he has led a law-abiding life, Judge, a decent life. He has tremendous support in the community here.

He has good character references. His parents are here in the courtroom traveling from California I think for a second time here to show support.

Part of my motion for downward departure, I entitled it as a Scooter Libby motion.

The president of the United States pardoned Scooter Libby under similar circumstances, I think, because he had given and dedicated his adult life to the service of his country, just as Captain Baird did.

My client is now going to be a saddled with a felony conviction. His military career is over with.

He's going to be registered as a sex offender for the next ten years, I think that's enough punishment.

In my opinion, Judge, he doesn't need to be incarcerated for 46 to 57 months.

I was going to suggest this morning that you reduce this to an offense level 10, give him a split sentence, and even an opportunity for probation.

I don't think that would be out of line with what he could have received or what he would have received here in the State of Nebraska had he been prosecuted a few blocks south of where we're at this morning.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

There is no actual victim here. I understand that the government's position that there is always a victim when this type of activity is discovered, but even the presentence report indicates there is not really identifiable victims here currently. So for all of those reasons, Judge, I would ask that you depart downward. THE COURT: Mr. Norris? MR. NORRIS: I can wrap it all up into allocution if you wish, if that was allocution, or I can just go on the downward departure, however you wish to proceed. THE COURT: I think that Mr. Schaefer's motion for downward departure is in the nature of the heartland motion for downward departure, and it's not hard for the court to conflate the heartland departure with a statutory deviation as well, and I have to say that I'm inclined to do that, but not nearly as much as Mr. Schaefer wants me to. But I think what we'll do is just move to allocution and the court's consideration with respect to the statutory sentencing as well as the guideline sentencing, and you've talked about the guidelines, Mr. Schaefer. Is there anything you wanted to add? MR. SCHAEFER: No. My client did want to address you in allocution briefly.

THE COURT: Mr. Baird?

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

```
MR. SCHAEFER: Thank you, Your Honor for allowing me
to speak. I wanted to take this moment to apologize to
everybody in this room right now for the fact that we're
here. It's my fault that we're here and nobody else's.
         I wrestled with this for a long time about a victim
and, you know, why everything was going the way it was going,
I couldn't see a victim in the case, and the people that
really suffered for this are the people sitting behind me,
people who have traveled from California twice now and they
shouldn't have to be going through that. I apologize to
everybody here involved even at all.
         I loved my life that I had before in the military,
serving. I spent a long time wishing I could have it back
and I know that's different now.
         I know that I'm going to be paying for this for a
long time.
         I've lost my career. I've lost most of my military
friends.
         I'm losing my house because I can't pay for it, and
I'm losing my freedom for a while.
         I have been on ankle bracelet for six months now and
I walked into Jim's office to start this over a year ago.
         I am ready for this to be over. I'm ready to go on
with my life however you see that fit, sir.
         I would like to make you two promises. One is that
```

```
I will, regardless of what happens today, I will do
 1
     everything in my power to lead a successful and normal life
 2
     away from any of the stigma that go with being a registered
 3
     sex offender or a felon.
 4
 5
              The other one is from the therapist that you had me
     go to for the second evaluation and the promise is that you
 6
 7
     will never see me again.
               I want to make that very clear. She gave me a low
 8
 9
     risk for re-offense and I promise you there will be no risk
10
     for re-offense.
               I do not presume to know how to do your job or tell
11
12
     you how to do your job.
13
               I will accept whatever sentence you give me and I
14
     will accept it graciously.
               I'm thankful that we've even got enhancements taken
15
     off. Three points is three points and I'm thankful for that.
16
17
              But regardless of what happens today, my life will
18
     go on and it will be okay and I accept whatever you have to
19
     say today.
20
               If you have any questions you have of me, I'll
     answer them now. If not, thank you very much.
21
22
              THE COURT: Thank you, sir. Mr. Norris?
23
              MR. NORRIS: First of all, Mr. Baird was very
24
     cooperative right from the outset from the point in which the
25
     disks were taken.
```

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

13

15

16

19

20

21

25

I heard from Mr. Schaefer. There was really no arguing about what was done or anything other than the effect and the impact that this would have on his military career, and obviously there's not much we can do about that. We could have charged this as a receipt, because even based on the search warrant it talked about how it came to him, in which case he would have been dealing with a five year mandatory minimum. We opted not to do because of the cooperation he gave us and --THE COURT: How would you have charged -- oh, under the new statute for receipt? 12 MR. NORRIS: Yes. If I had charged it with receipt because of what was sent to him from the server in Rankin, 14 Illinois, he received it as soon as it comes to there. Now, if we could have proved he received it in Nebraska and it was in a .com.cox.net, probably could have, 17 18 if we had gone through that. But the point is, we could have charged him with a fire year mandatory minimum. We didn't do that based upon his service to his country, based upon his cooperation, and based upon the fact 22 23 that he would be coming before you and asking for a downward departure. 24

I don't think a downward departure -- we are

```
recommending the low end of the guideline range.
 1
 2
               I don't know that a downward departure is
 3
     inappropriate. I'll say that much.
              But I will say that on the reasons that are
 4
 5
     proffered, they are not strong reasons in and of themselves.
 6
              His military service is something that can be
 7
     considered, but again is it that much greater than anything
 8
     else?
 9
              The fact he is going to get a higher sentence here
10
     than he would up the street cannot and should not be
11
     considered.
12
              The fact of the report that is before you, that
13
     report is done to make sure that he's not a pedophile.
               It's not like he gets bonus points for not being a
14
15
     pedophile; it's to make sure he doesn't injure, harm, or that
16
     we are not releasing somebody earlier or not putting the
     right restrictions on them.
17
18
              So for those reasons, I anticipate that there will
19
     be a downward departure in this case, I'm asking that it be a
20
     reasonable downward departure, and by reasonable I'm
     suggesting that it be closer to the lower end of the
21
     guideline range than to probation. Thank you.
22
23
               THE COURT: Is there any legal reason why the court
24
     should not proceed to sentencing at this time, Mr. Norris?
25
              MR. NORRIS:
                           No, sir.
```

THE COURT: Mr. Schaefer? 1 2 MR. SCHAEFER: No, Your Honor. 3 THE COURT: The first thing we have to say is who the victim is and the victims are the minors that are 4 5 exploited in order to get these picture to begin with and 6 those folks are the real victims in this case. And I think that's why Congress enacted the laws 8 that they've enacted and it's this court's responsibility to 9 make sure that this kind of criminal conduct ends. 10 That being said, it's interesting how the Congress and the sentencing guidelines have conflated trafficking from 11 12 receipt. 13 In other words, it seems to me that there should be more of a penalty for someone that is purveying pornography 14 15 than there is for someone that simply receives it or someone that possesses it. 16 17 This law allows the court, I believe, the 18 opportunity to examine individuals to find out whether they 19 are simply possessing child pornography and whether those 20 individuals are sexual predators or not. 21 If they are sexual predators, then the court I think 22 has an obligation to sentence them at the higher end of the 23 quidelines. 24 The question is, what guidelines are supposed to be 25 applied?

And Congress mandated the sentencing commission to change the way courts reviewed these cases and basically in my opinion conflated those individuals that are simply possessing child pornography with those individuals who are distributing it or are in the business of distributing it.

Because of the way the guidelines change, if I took the old guidelines for simple possession for Mr. Baird and did a guidelines calculation, that calculation would put him in about two years in prison as opposed to the four years that he has under the current calculation.

I had him evaluated to be sure that he was not a sexual predator and that he was a person that was simply possessing fundamentally as opposed to someone who was fundamentally in the distribution business.

So it seems to me that for that reason the guidelines are somewhat inapplicable, much the way the court's analysis recently in Kimbrough, and to a certain extent Gall, and I'll elaborate in a written opinion.

As far as the departure is concerned, it seems to me that Mr. Baird is somewhat outside the heartland in this case because he did attempt to extricate himself from this conduct by no longer using a computer to either receive or distribute and that it did happen a number of years before he was charged, and there didn't appear to be any continuing activity after he had ended his conduct.

I think I have to take into account the fact that he 1 2 has had an exemplary life otherwise. 3 But I don't think that the motion for downward 4 departure is as substantial an issue as the sentencing 5 quidelines. 6 It doesn't appear that Mr. Baird has any likelihood 7 of offending that is substantial. 8 Given the conduct here, which is basically 9 possession as opposed to distribution, it seems to me that a 10 sentence closer to two years is appropriate and not the four 11 years that is suggested by the guidelines. So for that reason the defendant is committed to the 12 13 custody of the United States Bureau of Prisons for 24 months. I'll recommend that he be incarcerated in a federal 14 15 facility as close to Omaha, Nebraska, as possible, and I'll 16 suggest FPC Yankton. 17 MR. SCHAEFER: Judge, can I interrupt? His family 18 all lives in California. He was planning on probably living 19 there after this is over and there is a federal institution called Atwater in California. 20 21 THE COURT: Where is his family living? 22 MR. SCHAEFER: Right outside of Fresno. 23 THE COURT: I will recommend as close to his family in Fresno, California, and I'll suggest the institution at 24 25 Atwater, and he's to be given credit for time served.

I'll allow him to self-surrender and the marshals 1 2 and probation officer will be in touch. 3 I will put him on a period of supervised release of five years, subject to the mandatory conditions. 4 5 The standard conditions are also imposed, and then 6 the following special conditions. Mr. Baird is to cooperate in the collection of a DNA 8 sample as required by law. 9 He's to submit his person, residence, office or 10 vehicle to search conducted by the probation officer at any 11 time. 12 Failure to submit to the search may be grounds for 13 revocation. The defendant will warn any other residents that his 14 premises are subject to search. 15 16 He is to have no contact or reside with children 17 under the ages of 18, including his own children, unless 18 approved in advance in writing by the probation officer in 19 consultation with treatment providers. 20 He shall report all incidental contact with children to the probation officer and the treatment provider. 21 22 He's not to be employed or participate in any 23 volunteer activities that involves contact with children

under the age of 18, except under circumstances approved in

advance in writing by the probation office.

24

25

He shall not access, view or possess any pornographic, sexually oriented or sexually stimulating materials.

And he shall not patronize places where such material or entertainment is available, and that would include auditory, telephonic, electronic media, or computer programs or services.

He's to have his residence and living situation approved in advance by the probation officer.

He shall sign releases of information as to allow all involved in his assessment, treatment and behavioral monitoring to communicate in order to share documentation with each other concerning his treatment.

He is to register as a sex offender in accordance with state and federal law and not move to a different address without the prior approval of the probation office.

He's to successfully complete any sex offender diagnostic evaluation, treatment or counseling program as directed by the probation office.

Reports pertaining to such assessments, treatments, shall be provided to the probation officer and he shall pay for them based on his ability to pay.

He's to participate in the victim awareness program as directed by the probation officer and pay for that based on his ability to pay.

1 He shall submit to quarterly monitoring of all 2 electronic medias as directed by the probation officer with 3 or without the cooperation of law enforcement. He's to provide the probation office with requested 4 5 financial information. 6 The drug testing requirement of 18, United States 7 Code, Section 3583(d) is suspended until further order of the 8 court because it appears that Mr. Baird is a low substance 9 abuse risk. 10 He's to report to the supervision unit of the United 11 States probation office here in Omaha within seventy-two 12 hours of his release from confinement. 13 That designation can change, but you need to make arrangements through the court or the Bureau of Prisons to 14 15 get your place of reporting changed if you intend to live in 16 California. 17 A special assessment of one hundred dollars is 18 imposed. No fine or court costs are imposed and the interest 19 requirement is waived. 20 Is there any legal reason why the court should not impose the sentence previously stated? Mr. Norris? 21 22 MR. NORRIS: No, Your Honor. 23 THE COURT: Mr. Schaefer? 24 MR. SCHAEFER: No, Judge. 25 THE COURT: The sentence previously stated shall be

```
1
     and hereby is imposed on the defendant, Eric Baird.
 2
              Mr. Baird, you have the right to appeal your
 3
     sentence and your conviction but you must file it within ten
     days of when I sign the order.
 4
 5
              If you want to appeal the case, I would suggest you
 6
     talk to Mr. Schaefer.
 7
               If you cannot afford the cost of a lawyer or the
 8
     cost appeal, he'll put together the necessary paperwork and
 9
     if you qualify you don't have to pay for your lawyer or the
10
     cost of the appeal.
11
              Mr. Norris, is there anything further?
12
              MR. NORRIS: Just his release, Your Honor, and I
13
     have no objection to his self-reporting.
              THE COURT: Mr. Schaefer?
14
15
              MR. SCHAEFER: No.
16
              THE COURT: Mr. Baird, the probation office and the
     marshal's office will be in touch with you as to where to
17
18
     report. We are adjourned.
19
                    (10:30 a.m. - End of Proceedings)
20
21
22
23
24
25
```

```
1
 2
                            C-E-R-T-I-F-I-C-A-T-E
 3
                I, Allan G. Kuhlman, do hereby certify that the
      foregoing is a correct transcript from the record of
 4
      proceedings in the above-entitled matter.
 5
                Dated this 14th day of December, 2010.
 6
 7
 8
                                               s/Allan G. Kuhlman
Allan G. Kuhlman
 9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
```